

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application and for indicating the acceptance of the formal drawings filed on April 11, 2000.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 40, 41, and 43-56 were pending in the present application. By way of this submission, claims 40, 41, and 43-56 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Also by way of this submission, claims 57-95 are added. Accordingly, claims 57-95 are now pending in the present application. Claims 57, 72, 86, and 91 are independent. The remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 57, 72, 86, and 91.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 40, 43, 47, and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. By way of this submission, claims 40, 43, 47, and 52 are cancelled and thus the rejection is moot as to those claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 40, 41, and 43-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the document entitled: "A simple and correct shared-queue algorithm using Compare-and-Swap" (hereinafter "Stone"), in view of the document entitled: "Data Structures and Program Design in C" (hereinafter "Kruse"), in further view of the document entitled: "Data Structures and Algorithm Analysis in C++" (hereinafter "Weiss"). By way of this submission,

claims 40, 41, and 43-56 are cancelled and thus the rejection is moot as to those claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully traversed.

New Claims

Claims 57-95 are added by way of this submission. Applicants respectfully assert no new matter has been introduced by way of these amendments as support for these additional claims may be found, for example, in Figures 3, 5A, 5B, 5C, in paragraphs [1035], [1041], [1046], and [1047] of the originally filed application, and in the originally filed claims.

Applicants respectfully assert that the cited art does not teach or suggest at least “obtaining a circular array... obtaining a front counter indexing a front location immediately following the third location and a back counter indexing a back location immediately before the first location.... executing a first pop back instruction using a first double compare and swap (DCAS) operation... executing a second pop front instruction without reading the back counter after executing the first pop back instruction and the first pop front instruction”, as recited by new independent claim 57. New independent claim 86 recites similar limitations. Thus, the cited art, whether viewed separately or in combination, does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of new independent claims 57 and 86. Accordingly, new independent claims 57 and 86 are allowable. Claims 58-71 and 87-90 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 57 and 86, and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Applicants respectfully assert that the cited art does not teach or suggest at least “obtaining a circular array...obtaining a front counter indexing a front location of the circular array immediately following the plurality of consecutive locations and a back counter indexing a back location of the circular array immediately before plurality of consecutive locations...

executing a first push front instruction using a second DCAS operation...executing a second push front instruction without reading the back counter after executing the first push back instruction and the first push front instruction”, as recited by new independent claim 72. New independent claim 91 recites similar limitations. Thus, the cited art, whether viewed separately or in combination, does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of new independent claims 72 and 91. Accordingly, new independent claims 72 and 91 are allowable. Claims 73-85 and 92-95 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 72 and 91, and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/959002; P4663).

Dated: June 23, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/

Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants